

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
AIKEN DIVISION

Latasha Denise Johnson,)	C/A No. 1:17-cv-03317-DCC
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	
)	ORDER
Recleim LLC, Douglas C. Huffer, Shannon S.)	
Matlock, Lukisha L. Gusworn-Cliffton, Bernard)	
Robinson,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's pro se Complaint alleging claims of employment discrimination in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended ("Title VII"), 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e et seq. ECF No. 1. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.), this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Paige J. Gossett for pre-trial proceedings and a Report and Recommendation ("Report"). On January 1, 2018, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that Defendants Douglas C. Huffer, Shannon S. Matlock, Lukisha L. Gusworn-Cliffton, and Bernard Robinson ("the Individual Defendants") be dismissed without prejudice and without issuance of service of process. ECF No. 10. Plaintiff filed objections to the Report. ECF No. 14.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. See *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of any portion of the Report of the

Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. See U.S.C. § 636(b). The Court will review the Report only for clear error in the absence of an objection. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” (citation omitted)).

The Magistrate Judge recommends summary dismissal of the Individual Defendants because Title VII does not allow for individual liability in causes of action brought against employers. ECF No. 10 at 2–3 (citing *Lissau v. S. Food Serv., Inc.*, 159 F.3d 177, 180 (4th Cir. 1998)). Plaintiff’s objections provide additional facts with respect to her Title VII claim; however, she fails to add claims that would subject the Individual Defendants to liability.

After considering the record in this case, the applicable law, the Report of the Magistrate Judge, and Plaintiff’s objections, the Court finds Plaintiff has failed to allege a plausible claim against the Individual Defendants. Accordingly, the Court adopts the Report by reference in this Order and overrules the objections. Defendants Douglas C. Huffer, Shannon S. Matlock, Lukisha L. Gusworn-Cliffon, and Bernard Robinson are DISMISSED without prejudice and without issuance of service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

July 2, 2018
Spartanburg, South Carolina

s/Donald C. Coggins, Jr.
United States District Judge

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this order pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.